

82



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/870,319	05/30/2001	Debasish Banerjee	ROC920010082US1	7641

7590 09/16/2004

IBM Corporation
Intellectual Property Law, Dept. 917
3605 Highway 52 North
Rochester, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER

BAYARD, DJENANE M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

82

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/870,319

Applicant(s)

BANERJEE ET AL.

Examiner

Djenane M Bayard

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/30/01, 7/30/01
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 3-4, 8-9, ~~21~~¹-23, 26 and 43-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,167,567 to Chiles et al

- a. As per claims 1 and 21, Chiles et al teaches a system in a distributed computing environment having a plurality of nodes located across geographically dispersed boundaries, comprising: a server configured with an internationalization application programming interface configured to extract an internationalization context provided by a client device (See col. 12, lines 50-65) ; and a resource manager configured to receive the internationalization context extracted by the server and process a request received from the client device using the internationalization context (See col. 13, lines 3-32).

- b. As per claim 3, Chiles et al teaches wherein the resource manager comprises an application which is configured to use the internationalization context to perform calculations and return a result formatted according to a specification of the internationalization context (See col. 13, lines 3-32)..
- c. As per claims 4 and 22, Chiles et al teaches wherein the internationalization context contains a country identification (See col. 13, lines 3-32).
- d. As per claim 8, Chiles et al teaches wherein the internationalization context comprises locale information and a time zone identifier (See col. 13, lines 3-33).
- e. As per claims 9 and 26, Chiles et al teaches wherein the locale information comprises at least one of a country identifier, a language identifier and a currency identifier (See col. 13, lines 3-33).
- f. As per claim 23, Chiles et al teaches wherein the client and the plurality of servers are located across geographically dispersed boundaries (See col. 3, lines 28-45).
- g. As per claim 43, Chiles et al teaches a computer data signal embodied in a transmission medium, comprising an internationalization context containing at least a locale specification and a time zone identifier, wherein the internationalization context configures a processor of a computer to process requests according to the internationalization context (See col. 13, lines 3-

Art Unit: 2141

33).

h. As per claim 44, Chiles et al teaches wherein the locale specification comprises at least one of a country identifier, a language identifier and a currency identifier (See col. 3, lines 3-33).

3. Claims 10-20 and 27-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0184308 to Levy et al.

a. As per claim 10 and 33, Levy et al teaches a method operative in a distributed computing environment having clients and a plurality of servers located across geographically dispersed boundaries, comprising: receiving a first request from a client at a server (See page 2, paragraph [0014]); receiving a second request from the client at the server, wherein the second request comprises an internationalization context for processing the first request (See page 7, paragraph [0076]); extracting the internationalization context from the second request; and processing the first request at the server using the internationalization context (See page 3, paragraph [0017]).

b. As per claims 11 and 34, Levy et al teaches processing the first request comprises providing the first request and internationalization context to an application to perform calculations using the internationalization context and return a result formatted according to the internationalization context (See page 7, paragraph [0073-0076]).

c. As per claim 12 and 35, Levy et al teaches sending the internationalization context from the server to at least one of the plurality of servers in the distributed computing environment (See page 2, paragraph [0014]).

d. As per claims 13,28 and 36, Levy et al teaches wherein the internationalization context contains a country identifier (See page 4, paragraph [0041]).

e. As per claims 14, 29 and 37, Levy et al teaches wherein the internationalization context contains a language identifier (See page 4, paragraph [0041]).

f. As per claims 15,30 and 38, Levy et al teaches wherein the internationalization context contains a time zone identifier (See page 4, paragraph 0042)).

g. As per claims 16, 31, 39, 46 and 53, Levy et al teaches wherein the internationalization context contains at least a locale specification and a time zone identifier (See page 4, paragraph [0042]).

h. As per claims 17 ,32 and 40, Levy et al teaches wherein the locale specification comprises at least one of a country identifier, a language identifier and a currency identifier (See page 4, paragraph [0040-0042]).

i. As per claim 18 and 41, Levy et al teaches processing the first request according to a country identifier of the server if the internationalization context does not contain a country identifier (See page 8, paragraph [0085-0086]).

g. As per claim 19, Levy et al teaches processing the first request according to a universal time zone identifier if the internationalization context does not contain a time zone identifier of the client (See page 8, paragraph [0085-0086])

k. As per claims 20 and 42, Levy et al teaches processing the first request according to a time zone identifier of the server if the internationalization context does not contain a time zone identifier (See page 8, paragraph [0085-0086]).

l. As per claim 27, Levy et al teaches parsing a message from a client computer, wherein the message contains internationalization context (See page 2, paragraph [0014]); extracting the internationalization context from the request (See page 3, paragraph [0017]); and providing the internationalization context to an application in order to configure the application to process a request from the client computer according to the internationalization context provided by the client computer (See page 3 and 4, paragraph [0038-0042]).

m. As per claim 45, Levy et al teaches propagating internationalization context information, comprising: receiving, at a first computer, a first request from a second computer, the first request including an internationalization context (See page 2, paragraph [0014]); extracting the

internationalization context from the first request; and associating the internationalization context with a thread executing at the first computer (See page 4, paragraph [0040]).

n. As per claim 47, Levy et al teaches sending a first main body of the first request to the thread (See page 4, paragraph [0040]).

o. As per claim 48, Levy et al teaches attaching the internationalization context to a second main body to form a second request; and transmitting the second request to a third computer (see page 2, paragraph [0014]).

p. As per claim 49, Levy et al teaches wherein the second main body is associated with an interface, and wherein the internationalization component is not added to the interface (See page 3, paragraph [0017]).

q. As per claim 50, Levy et al teaches wherein the thread comprises a legacy application thread (See page 2, paragraph [0014]).

r. As per claim 51, Levy et al teaches wherein the internationalization component comprises culture sensitive information (See page 4, paragraph [0041]).

s. As per claim 52, Levy et al teaches generating a main body of a request (See page 2, paragraph [0014]); and attaching an internationalization context to the main body, wherein the

Art Unit: 2141

internationalization context is not added to the application interface (See page 3, paragraph [0040-0042]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2, 5-7 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,167,567 to Chiles et al in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0184308 to Levy et al.

a. As per claim 2, Chiles et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Chiles et al fails to teach wherein the resource manager is a database management system.

Levy et al teaches a globalization and normalization features for processing business objects. Furthermore, Levy et al teaches wherein the resource manager is a database management system.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein the resource manager is a database management system as taught by Levy et al in order to provide a multi locale processing configuration for uniformly

processing multi locale information being sent to and received from a variety of subsystem (See page 3, paragraph 0017)).

b. As per claims 5 and 24, Chiles et al teaches the claimed invention as des cribbed above. However, Chiles et al fails to teach wherein the internationalization context contains a language identification.

Levy et al teaches a globalization and normalization features for processing business objects. Furthermore, Levy et al teaches wherein the internationalization context contains a language identification (See page 4, paragraph [0041]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein the internationalization context contains a language identification as taught by Levy et al in order to provide a multi locale processing configuration for uniformly processing multi locale information being sent to and received from a variety of subsystem (See page 3, paragraph 0017)).

c. As per claims 6 and 25, Chiles et al teaches the claimed invention as des cribbed above. However, Chiles et al fails to teach wherein the internationalization context contains a time zone identifier.

Levy et al teaches a globalization and normalization features for processing business objects. Furthermore, Levy et al teaches wherein the internationalization context contains a time zone identifier (See page 4, paragraph [0042]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein the internationalization context contains a time zone identifier as taught by Levy et al in order to provide a multi locale processing configuration for uniformly processing multi locale information being sent to and received from a variety of subsystem (See page 3, paragraph 0017)).

d. As per claim 7, Chiles et al teaches the claimed invention as des cribbed above. However, Chiles et al fails to teach wherein the internationalization context is transmitted by the server to at least one of the plurality of nodes in the distributed computer environment.

Levy et al teaches wherein the internationalization context is transmitted by the server to at least one of the plurality of nodes in the distributed computer environment (See page 2, paragraph [0014]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein the internationalization context is transmitted by the server to at least one of the plurality of nodes in the distributed computer environment in order to provide a multi locale processing configuration for uniformly processing multi locale information being sent to and received from a variety of subsystem (See page 3, paragraph 0017)).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0184509 to Scheidt et al teaches a multiple factor-based user identification and authentication.

U.S. Patent No./ 6,151, 631 to Ansell et al teaches a territorial determination of a remote computer location in a wide area network for conditional delivery of digitized products.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Djenane M Bayard whose telephone number is (703) 305-6606. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 AM-4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (703) 305-4003. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Djenane Bayard

Patent Examiner

Application/Control Number: 09/870,319
Art Unit: 2141

Page 12


RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER